

APPENDIX B-2

**SUPPLEMENT 1 (DATED FEBRUARY 2004)
PREPARED IN RESPONSE TO LEA COMMENTS**

GREGORY CANYON LANDFILL
JOINT TECHNICAL DOCUMENT
SUPPLEMENT 1

The proposed Gregory Canyon Landfill project, like most landfill projects (i.e., both new and lateral/vertical expansions) undergo a number of changes, not only through development of the master design plans, but also as a result of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)-induced changes related to the reduction of potential impacts. Additionally, as was the case with the proposed Gregory Canyon Landfill, some of the changes were as a result of regulatory agency comments. The "proposed project" for Gregory Canyon Landfill, as presented in the certified Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) Chapter 3.0, Project Description was changed/modified during the development and review process. In addition, Section 15126(a) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR:

"Describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project, or to the location of the project, that would feasibly attain most of the basic project objectives but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant environmental effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives."

Chapter 6.0, Alternatives to the Proposed Project, of the FEIR evaluated alternatives to the project. The project presented in the Joint Technical Document (JTD) reflects a combination of features from both the "proposed project" and the "alternative". Fundamentally, the project described in the JTD was downsized from the "proposed project."

Two of the major changes reflected in the JTD and evaluated in Chapter 6.0 of the FEIR were modifications to the bottom contours or sub-grade of the landfill and the waste containment system. These changes came as result of comments received from the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board on the project. Specifically, the subgrade design was changed to bring the bottom of the landfill up above the highest anticipated ground water level. As a result, the excavation quantity and associated refuse capacity were reduced. In addition, the amount of daily and intermediate cover needed over the life of the project was also reduced.

The project described in the JTD will result in less potential impacts than the impacts that would occur from the "proposed project" in the FEIR because the JTD reflects a project that is smaller in size and scope. The following table was prepared to present information presented in the FEIR on the "proposed project", alternatives to the project and the JTD.

Description	FEIR "Proposed Project"	FEIR "Alternative"	JTD
Gross Airspace	64.4 mcy (p. 3-60)	"Not Stated"	60.0 mcy (p. B.1-11)
Net Airspace	61.9 mcy (p. 3-60)	"Not Stated"	57.5 mcy (p. B.1-11, C.3-1)
Refuse Volume	49.44 mcy or 33.43 million tons (p. 3-60)	31 Million Tons (p. 6-78)	46.0 mcy or 31.1 million tons (p. B.1-11)
Cover Operations	12.4 mcy (p. 3-36)	12.7 for daily, internal	11.5 mcy + 1.2 for final cover (p. C.2-2) (p. B.4-16)
Final Cover and Excavation Materials	9.8 mcy (p. 3-36)	Final Cover (p. 6-67) 7.9 (p. 6-76)	1.2 mcy + 7.9 mcy (p. B.4-16)
Material Excavated from Landfill Footprint available for Cover	40% or 3.9 mcy (p. 3-37)	"Not Stated"	60% or 3.9 mcy (p. B.4-16)
Shortfall of Useable Material	4.0 mcy (p. 3-37)	"Not Stated"	3.1 mcy (p. B.4-16)
Use of ADC Reducing Demand for Cover Soil	37.5% (p. 3-37)	"Not Stated"	"by as much as one third" (p. B.4-16)
Temporary Stockpile	Not Discussed	"Not Stated"	9.4 mcy (p. C.2-23)
Phase I Excavation	4.6 mcy (p. 3-61)	"Not Stated"	3.7 mcy (p. C.2-26)
Phase I Construction of Ancillary Facilities	0.8 mcy of the 4.6 mcy (p. 3-61)	"Not Stated"	0.3 mcy of the 3.7 mcy (p. C.2-26)
Phase I Gross Airspace	8.5 mcy (p. 3-61)	"Not Stated"	8.1 mcy (p. C.2-27)
Bridge Length	640', with five sets of two piles each (p. 3-14)	"Not Stated"	681', supported by five large diameter piers (p. C.2-28)
Bridge Buttress (at side slopes)	3:1 (p. 3-19)	"Not Stated"	2:1 (p. C.2-29)
Phase II Depth of Excavation	430 feet amsl (Exhibit 3-20)	"Not Stated"	525 feet amsl or 25 feet below ground level (p. C.2-29, Figure 22)
Phase II Excavation	6.4 mcy (p. 3-64)	"Not Stated"	3.7 mcy (p. C.2-29)
Phase II Gross Airspace	10.8 mcy (p. 3-64)	"Not Stated"	6.3 mcy (p. C.2-30)
Phase III/IV Gross Airspace	43.6 mcy (p. 3-64)	"Not Stated"	43.1 mcy (p. C.2-31)
Liner Configuration	Single Composite (p. 3-11)	"Double Composite" (p. 6-75)	Double Composite (p. C. 2-7)
Depth of Excavation (Bottom)	Between 370 and 440 feet (p. 3-10)	Between 400 and 700 feet (p. 6-76)	Between 380 and 750 feet (Figure 12)

As can be seen on the attached table, the quantities presented in the JTD reflect a reduced project which will create less potential impacts to the environment. As long as the project

described in the permitting documents does not exceed the scope and duration of that analyzed in the CEQA document, no additional environmental evaluation is necessary. The project described in the JTD is within the perimeters of the project and alternatives analyzed in the certified FEIR. Therefore, no additional environmental analysis is warranted.